TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
		Cultural Resources	
On- and off-site interpretive facilities would be developed at appropriate archeological, historical, and cultural sites in a manner that would not adversely impact the site.	On- and off-site interpretive materials would be developed at appropriate archeological, historical, and cultural sites only when considered mitigation for authorized or permitted activities.	On- and off-site interpretive facilities would be developed for all appropriate archeological, historical, and cultural resources only if it would not adversely impact the site.	Interpretative facilities would be developed at Old Rock Saloon and Nine-Mile Canyon archaeological sites. A facility would be developed in Nine-Mile Canyon to interpret and manage use in the district. A self-guided tour would be developed for important historic structures and locations in Browns Park area.
OHV travel in the Uintah Foothills area would be limited to designated routes, and oil and gas leasing would be subject to timing and controlled surface-use stipulations or no surface occupancy (NSO) to protect cultural sites that include lithic scatters, burials, tool manufacturing sites, structures, and rock shelters.	Same as Alternative A.	The Uintah Foothills would be closed to oil and gas leasing and OHV travel to protect high-density cultural site areas that include burial sites, petroglyphs, task sites, pictographs, and villages.	The Uintah Foothills would be open to oil and gas leasing and to OHV travel.
OHV travel in the Little/Devils Hole area would be limited to designated routes to protect cultural sites that include lithic scatters, burials, tool manufacturing sites, structures, and rock shelters.	Same as Alternative A.	The Little/Devils Hole area would be closed to oil and gas leasing and OHV travel to protect high-density cultural sites that include lithic scatters, burials, tool manufacturing sites, structures, and rock shelters.	The Little/Devils Hole areas would be open to oil and gas leasing and to OHV travel.
OHV travel in the Upper Willow Creek area of the Book Cliffs would be limited to designated routes, and oil and gas leasing would be subject to timing and controlled surface-use stipulations to protect high-density cultural sites that include pictographs, petroglyphs, burials, and storage crypts and to preserve the unique representation of the Archaic period.	Same as Alternative A.	The Upper Willow Creek area would be closed to oil and gas leasing and OHV travel to protect high-density cultural sites that include pictographs, petroglyphs, burials, and storage crypts and to preserve the unique representation of the Archaic period.	The Upper Willow Creek areas would be open to oil and gas leasing and to OHV travel.
OHV travel in Four Mile Wash (T10S, R19E, Section 18) would be limited to designated routes, and oil and gas leasing would be subject to timing and controlled surface-use stipulations or NSO to protect traditional sacred properties.	OHV travel in Four Mile Wash (T10S, R19E, Section 18) would be limited to designated routes and open to oil and gas leasing with standard stipulations to protect traditional sacred properties.	The Four Mile Wash (T10S, R19E, Section 18) would be closed to oil and gas leasing and OHV travel to protect traditional sacred properties.	The Four Mile Wash would be open to oil and gas leasing and OHV travel.
		Fire Management – Figures 3 &4	
Prescribed burning would be allowed for approximately 156,425 acres per decade.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Prescribed burns would be employed on up to 27,950 acres in the Book Cliffs RMP area. For the Diamond Mountain RMP, 22,950 acres of pinion-juniper woodlands and sagebrush communities would be manipulated (methods would include prescribed burning).
		Forage – All Localities – Figure 5	
Unless otherwise specified by a management plan, up to 50% utilization of forage on uplands would be allowed.	Unless otherwise specified by a management plan, up to 60% utilization of forage on uplands would be allowed.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
137,838 AUMs would be allocated for livestock, 104,871 AUMs would be allocated for wildlife, and 2,940 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses.	139,163 AUMs would be allocated for livestock, 104,871 AUMs would be allocated for wildlife and 0 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses.	77,294 AUMs would be allocated for livestock, 106,196 AUMs would be allocated for wildlife, and 3960 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses.	146,161 AUMs would be allocated for livestock, 96,607 AUMs would be allocated for wildlife, and 3,360 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses.
BONANZA LOCALITY			
If forage allocation reductions are necessary to make significant progress towards or sustain rangeland health, the following criteria would be followed to make the needed reductions:			
Demonstrated conflicts between wildlife and livestock			

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Forage – Bonanza Locality (continued)			
Would proportionately reduce sheep and/or cattle and pronghorn. However, pronghorn use would not be reduced below 502 AUMs.	(1) First, pronghorn use would be reduced, but not below 502 AUMs. (2) Second, appropriate reductions in big game would be made prior to making needed reductions in livestock numbers.	(1) Livestock use would be reduced. (2) Pronghorn use would not be reduced. (3) Deer or other big game use would not be reduced.	Unspecified.
If additional forage is available and rangeland health is being sustained, or if significant progress is being made towards sustaining rangeland health, increased use would be considered based on the following criteria:			
Additional forage meets the dietary needs of livestock and wildlife			
Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game. Wildlife AUMs that are made available would go to pronghorn and deer.	(1) Up to 502 AUMs of forage would be provided for pronghorn and sheep and/or cattle use would be increased in accordance with available forage. (2) If the additional AUMs are not needed for livestock or pronghorn, any remaining AUMs would be allocated to deer.	(1) Wildlife use would be increased in accordance with available forage. (2) Livestock use would not be increased above permitted use.	(1) Optimum wildlife levels would be provided for where conflicts with livestock do not exist. Specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels; and specific to pronghorn, habitat would be managed to support increased levels. (2) Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. Rather, all livestock use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. When livestock use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. Additionally, any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.
BONANZA WILD HORSE HERD AREA LOCALITY			
Not applicable (no wild horses).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative D.	Would allocate 1,020 AUMs for wild horses.
If forage allocation reductions are necessary to make significant progress towards or sustain rangeland health, the following criteria would be followed to make the needed reductions:			
Demonstrated conflicts between wildlife and livestock			
Would proportionately reduce sheep and pronghorn; however, would not reduce pronghorn use below 239 AUMs.	Wildlife use would be reduced; however, pronghorn use would not be reduced below 239 AUMs nor deer use below 147 AUMs.	(1) Livestock use would be reduced. (2) Wildlife use would not be reduced.	(1) First, would reduce pronghorn use but not below 289 AUMs. (2) Second, would reduce sheep use.
Demonstrated conflicts with wild horses and livestock			
Not applicable (no wild horses).	Same as Alternative A.	(1) Livestock use would be reduced. (2) Wild horse use would be reduced, but not below 480 AUMs.	Unspecified.
Demonstrated conflicts with wild horses and wildlife			
Not applicable (no wild horses).	Same as Alternative A.	Wild horse and wildlife use would be proportionately reduced.	Unspecified.
If additional forage is available and rangeland health is being sustained, or if significant progress is being made towards sustaining rangeland health, increased use would be considered based on the following criteria[1]:			

[1] Based on the 1999 forage inventory, there is the potential of allocating an additional 6,871 AUMs (includes 1,860 AUMs for wild horses identified in the Book Cliffs Resource Management Plan Involving the Bonanza Wild Horse Herd Area, p. 13); continued vegetation monitoring would be the basis for any change in forage assignments allocations.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES			
Alternative A	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D Current Management (no action)**
Additional forage meets the dietary needs of livestock and wildlife			
Forage – Bonanza Wild Horse Herd Area Locality (continued)			
Sheep and wildlife use would be increased proportionately in accordance with available forage.	Sheep and cattle use would be increased in accordance with available forage.	(1) Pronghorn and deer use would be increased in accordance with available forage. (2) Livestock would not be increased above permitted use.	Pronghorn use would be increased until there are conflicts with sheep. Sheep use would increase in accordance with available forage.
Additional forage meets the dietary needs of horses, sheep, or pronghorn			
No wild horses. Sheep and wildlife use would be increased proportionately in accordance with available forage.	No wild horses. Sheep and cattle use would be increased in accordance with available forage.	Same as alternative D.	(1) Would not increase AML. (2) Would increase pronghorn use until there are conflicts with sheep. (3) Would increase sheep use in accordance with available forage.
Additional forage meets the dietary needs of horses and sheep			
No wild horses. Sheep use would be increased in accordance with available forage.	No wild horses. Same as Alternative A.	Would increase horse use in accordance with available forage.	Unspecified.
FORAGE – BOOK CLIFFS LOCALITY			
1,325 unallocated AUMs acquired by acquisition of private lands (Cripple Cowboy) would be reserved for watershed. Although wildlife and livestock would not be excluded from utilizing these lands, no additional AUMs would be allocated.	1,325 unallocated AUMs acquired by acquisition of private lands (Cripple Cowboy) would be allocated to livestock.	1,325 unallocated AUMs acquired by acquisition of private lands (Cripple Cowboy) would be allocated to wildlife.	Unspecified.
1,200 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses in the Winter Ridge Herd Area. 1740 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses in the Hill Creek HMA.	Forage for wild horses would not be allocated in Winter Ridge Herd Area or Hill Creek HMA.	Same as Alternative A.	2,340 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses in the Hill Creek Herd Management Area.
If monitoring shows that reductions are necessary in all areas except the Wild Horse Herd Areas because of:			
Demonstrated conflicts between wildlife and livestock			
Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Big game use would be reduced.	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified.
If monitoring shows that reductions are necessary in the Wild Horse Herd Areas because of:			
Demonstrated conflicts between big game, livestock, and wild horses			
Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock, big game, and wild horses.	(No wild horses). Big game use would be reduced.	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified.
Demonstrated conflicts between big game and livestock			
Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Big game use would be reduced.	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified.
Demonstrated conflicts between livestock and wild horses			
Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between livestock and wild horses.	Not applicable (no wild horses).	Livestock use would be reduced.	Unspecified.
Demonstrated conflicts between wild horses and big game			

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Reductions in grazing use would be divided proportionately between wild horses and big game.	Not applicable (no wild horses).	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
Forage – Book Cliffs Locality (continued)			
Additional forage would be allocated in areas except Wild Horse Herd Areas as follows:			
Cattle Allotments			
60% to restore suspended cattle AUMs and 40% for wildlife. After restoring all suspended AUMs, allocate additional AUMs proportionately between cattle and wildlife.	60% to restore suspended cattle AUMs and 40% for wildlife. After restoring all suspended AUMs, allocate any additional forage to livestock.	60% to restore suspended cattle AUMs and 40% for wildlife. After restoring all suspended AUMs, allocate additional forage to wildlife.	(1) Optimum wildlife levels where conflicts with livestock do not exist; specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels. (2) Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. Rather, all livestock use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. (3) When livestock use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. Additionally, any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.
Sheep Allotments			
Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Any additional forage would be allocated to sheep.	Forage increases would be allocated to big game. If additional forage were not needed by big game, it would be given to livestock. Big game numbers would be allowed to increase only to the point livestock permitted use would not be reduced.	(1) Optimum wildlife levels would be provided for where conflicts with livestock do not exist; specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels and increased levels of pronghorn on East Bench. (2) Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. Rather, all livestock-use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. (3) When livestock-use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. Additionally, any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.
Additional forage would be allocated in the Winter Ridge and Hill Creek Wild Horse Herd Areas as follows:			
Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock, big game, and wild horses. If wild horses or big game do not need additional forage, it would be given to livestock.	No wild horses. Additional forage would be allocated to livestock.	Forage increases would be divided proportionately between big game and wild horses. If wild horses or big game do not need additional forage, it would be given to livestock. Big game and wild horse numbers would be allowed to increase only to the point livestock permitted use would not be reduced.	(1) Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. Rather, all livestock-use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. When livestock-use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. Additionally, any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES			
Alternative A	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D Current Management (no action)**
			based on allotment evaluations. (2) Optimum wildlife levels would be provided for where conflicts with livestock do not exist; specific to deer, habitat would be managed to support significantly increased levels.
Forage – Blue Mountain Locality			
If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, livestock permitted use and wildlife use would be reduced proportionately. The first year livestock reductions would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, wildlife use would be reduced to a level at which no livestock/wildlife forage conflict exists. Any additional necessary reductions would be made to livestock. Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, livestock permitted use would be reduced. Adjustments would be attained by decision or agreement. The first year reductions would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. Rather, all livestock use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. When livestock use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. Additionally, any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations. Decreases in livestock forage would be implemented over a five-year period.
Additional forage would be allocated in the Blue Mountain area as follows:			
Additional AUMs would be provided as follows: Forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game.	Additional AUMs realized through management changes and/or livestock-oriented vegetation treatments would be assigned to livestock.	Additional AUMs realized through management and/or created from wildlife-oriented vegetation treatment would be provided to wildlife.	(1) Habitat for deer would be managed to support current levels. (2) Target livestock AUM figures are not final stocking levels. Rather, all livestock-use adjustments would be implemented through documented mutual agreement or by decision. When livestock-use adjustments would be implemented by decision, it would be based on operator consultation and monitoring of resource conditions. Additionally, any necessary adjustments in stocking levels or other management practices, including changes or additions to existing management facilities, would be based on allotment evaluations.
DIAMOND MOUNTAIN LOCALITY			
If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, then livestock and wildlife use would be reduced proportionately. The first year livestock reductions would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. Five-year agreements would be developed and signed outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, then wildlife use would be reduced to a level at which no livestock/wildlife forage conflict exists. Any additional necessary reductions would be made to livestock.	If monitoring indicates forage assignments cannot be met, livestock permitted use would be reduced. Adjustments would be attained by decision or agreement. The first year, reductions would be made with an initial 10% adjustment. Five-year agreements would be developed and signed at the same time outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level.	If monitoring indicates that forage assignments cannot be met, reductions would be made using the following criteria: (1) Temporary, nonrenewable livestock AUMs above permitted use would be reduced first. (2) On wildlife crucial habitat, livestock permitted use would be reduced if there is a conflict between use by livestock and wildlife and if wildlife numbers are within the herd unit or population objective levels. If there is no conflict and the reduction is necessary because of overuse by either livestock or wildlife, that animal's numbers would be reduced. (3) On non-crucial wildlife habitat, livestock permitted use and wildlife numbers would be reduced equally. The first year, there would be an initial 10% adjustment in permitted use. Five-year agreements would be developed

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
			and signed at the same time outlining the process for phased reductions to the desired level. (4) Temporary adjustments in use due to effects of drought would be made to livestock and/or wildlife as needed based on monitoring.
Forage – Diamond Mountain Locality (continued)			
Additional forage would be allocated in the Diamond Mountain area as follows:			
Additional AUMs would be provided as follows: In the northern half of the area (Diamond Mountain and Browns Park), additional AUMs would be provided to livestock until wildlife demands require them. In the southern half of the area (Ashley Valley and Myton Bench), forage increases would be divided proportionately between livestock and big game on non-crucial wildlife areas.	Additional AUMs realized through management changes and/or vegetation treatments would be assigned to livestock.	Additional AUMs realized through management changes and/or vegetation treatment would be provided to wildlife or retained for watershed.	Additional AUMs (over permitted use) would be provided to livestock on a temporary, nonrenewable basis until identified for crucial wildlife needs. Additional AUMs outside crucial wildlife areas could be assigned to livestock.
Land and Realty Management – Figure 6			
LAND ACCESS			
Public access to the White River would be pursued at the mouth of Cowboy Canyon, Bonanza Bridge, and Wagon Hound Road.	Public access to the White River would not be pursued at the mouth of Cowboy Canyon, Bonanza Bridge, and Wagon Hound Road.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
An easement for the old Uintah Railroad bed from the Utah/ Colorado line to Watson in Evacuation Creek would not be pursued.	Same as Alternative A.	An easement for the old Uintah Railroad bed would be pursued from the Utah/ Colorado line to Watson in Evacuation Creek.	Unspecified.
Acquisition of Indian trust lands in Bitter Creek would be pursued.	Administrative access only across the Indian trust lands in Bitter Creek would be pursued.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
Acquisition of Indian trust lands near the confluence of South and Sweetwater Canyon would be pursued.	Administrative access only across Indian trust lands near the confluence of South and in Sweetwater Canyon would be pursued.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
WITHDRAWALS			
Locatable mineral withdrawal or other protective measures that would preclude mineral entry in the Green River Scenic Corridor in Browns Park (8,208 acres), White River (9,218 acres), Lears Canyon relict vegetation areas (1,375 acres), the Book Cliffs Natural Area (401 acres), and the lower Green River Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) (17,063 acres).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Locatable mineral withdrawal or other protective measures that would preclude mineral and agricultural entry on (in priority order): the Green River Scenic Corridor in Browns Park (19,400 acres), the relict vegetation areas (3,600 acres), the lower Green River ACEC (7,900 acres), and developed and potential recreation sites (5,000 acres).
Livestock and Grazing Management – Figures 7-10			
Lands acquired by acquisition of properties in the Nine-Mile area would not be grazed to enhance riparian and watershed values.	Livestock grazing would be allowed in the Nine-Mile Acquired Area if such use is controlled, of short duration, and would not detract from recreation and/or riparian values along the river.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
SEASONS OF USE			
PHENOLOGY Livestock grazing would be allowed in Area 1 under the discretion of the VFO.	BILLED USE Grazing in Area 1 would be allowed under the discretion of the VFO.	ADJUDICATED Livestock grazing could be allowed under the discretion of the VFO.	PERMITTED Livestock grazing would be allowed in Area 1 under the discretion of the VFO.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Livestock grazing would be allowed from 6/1 to 10/31 in Area 2 or 5/1 with a deferment.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/19 to 10/7 in Area 2.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 6/15 to 8/31 in Area 2.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/19 to 10/7 in Area 2.
Livestock and Grazing Management – Seasons of Use (continued)			
Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/1 to 11/30 in Area 3.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/31 to 11/1 in Area 3.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 6/15 to 8/31 in Area 3.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 6/3 to 10/6 in Area 3.
Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/1 to 6/1 in Area 4.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 4/25 to 5/26 and 11/1 to 12/31 in Area 4.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 10/1 to 3/1 (Fall/Winter) in Area 4.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 6/1 to 10/31 in Area 4.
Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/1 to 6/1 and 10/1 to 2/28 in Area 5	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 4/10 to 5/26 and 10/1 to 1/30 in Area 5.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 10/1 to 3/1 (Fall/Winter) in Area 5.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 4/3 to 6/15 and 10/31 to 1/30 in Area 5.
Livestock grazing would be allowed from 10/1 to 4/1 or 5/1 w/deferment in Area 6	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 10/26 to 5/8 in Area 6.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 10/1 to 3/1 (Fall/Winter) in Area 6.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 3/10 to 4/24 and 6/23 to 8/30 and 10/21 to 2/28 in Area 6.
Livestock grazing would be allowed from 4/1 to 5/31 and/or 9/1 to 10/31 in Area 7.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/20 to 12/1 in Area 7.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 10/1 to 11/30(Fall) in Area 7.	Livestock grazing would be allowed from 5/26 to 10/20 in Area 7.
Minerals and Energy Resources – Figures 15-18			
OIL AND GAS & COAL-BED METHANE			
Approximately 983,905 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, including coal bed methane, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 1,113,116 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, including coal bed methane, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 858,619 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing, including coal bed methane, subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 918,315 acres would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms.
Approximately 796,955 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing with controlled surface use.	Approximately 706,281 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing with controlled surface use.	Approximately 768,466 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing with controlled surface use.	About 617,715 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing with controlled surface use.
Approximately 69,302 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing with NSO.	Approximately 42,053 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing with NSO.	Approximately 58,670 acres would be administratively available for oil and gas leasing with NSO.	Surface occupancy would be precluded on approximately 136,930 acres to protect wildlife, watershed, and recreation.
Approximately 63,839 acres would be closed to leasing.	Approximately 52,550 acres would be closed to leasing.	Approximately 228,246 acres would be closed to leasing.	52,540 acres would be closed to leasing.
COMBINED HYDROCARBON AREAS/SPECIAL TAR SAND AREAS			
Approximately 51,829 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 61,424 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 43,530 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing subject to standard lease terms.	Approximately 116,208 acres in areas identified for combined hydrocarbon leasing would be available for future tar sand development subject to standard lease terms.
Approximately 200,836 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with controlled surface use.	Approximately 198,238 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with controlled surface use.	Approximately 195,566 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with controlled surface use.	Approximately 101,279 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with controlled surface use.
Approximately 10,803 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with NSO.	Approximately 3,806 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with no surface occupancy.	Approximately 3,696 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with no surface occupancy.	Approximately 11,589 acres would be administratively available for combined hydrocarbon leasing with no surface occupancy.
Approximately 35,044 acres would be closed to leasing.	Approximately 35,044 acres would be closed to leasing.	Approximately 55,720 acres would be closed to leasing.	Approximately 35,045 acres would be closed to leasing.
GILSONITE AND PHOSPHATE (NON-ENERGY LEASABLES)			
87,724 acres would be open for prospecting, leasing, and development of phosphate with standard and special stipulations within the phosphate occurrence areas.	Same as Alternative A.	63,571 acres would be open for prospecting, leasing, and development of phosphate with standard and special stipulations within the phosphate occurrence areas.	84,600 acres would be open for prospecting, leasing, and development of phosphate with standard and special stipulations within the phosphate occurrence areas
172 miles would be available for prospecting, leasing, and development of gilsonite (additional veins located through	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	168 miles would be open for prospecting, leasing, and development of gilsonite (additional veins located through

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
field study or prospecting not shown on Figure 15 would also be available if such are within "open" category lands).			field study or prospecting not shown on Figure 18 would also be available if such are within "open" category lands). (1) Restrictions placed on the lease or subsequent conditions of approval would not apply to maintenance and production of existing facilities. (2) Restrictions from other resource decisions would be applied to new leases, or at the time of lease renewal, for existing leases. (3) Exploration and development of phosphate within crucial deer and elk winter range would be allowed year 'round, but would require management actions designed to mitigate both short- and long-term loss of habitat.
Minerals and Energy Resources (continued)			
OIL SHALE			
Within the known oil shale leasing areas, 299,831 acres would be open for leasing if regulations providing for such are promulgated. (BLM does not have the necessary regulations in place to lease oil shale at this time.)	Within the known oil shale leasing areas, 305,736 acres would be open for leasing if regulations providing for such are promulgated. (BLM does not have the necessary regulations in place to lease oil shale at this time.)	Within the known oil shale lease areas, 292,453 acres would be open for leasing if regulations providing for such are promulgated. (BLM does not have the necessary regulations in place to lease oil shale at this time.)	Within the known oil shale leasing areas, 290,740 acres would be open for leasing.
MINERAL MATERIALS			
415,395 acres would be available for mineral material disposal with standard and special stipulations.	432,953 acres would be available for mineral material disposal with standard and special stipulations.	388,699 acres would be available for mineral material disposal with standard and special stipulations.	387,700 acres would be available for mineral material disposal with standard and special stipulations.
Paleontology			
Areas with significant fossils would be identified through predictive modeling and broad-scale sampling. Assessment and mitigation would be required as needed in these areas.	Damage to significant fossils would be prevented through lease notices, stipulations, and other requirements. Impacts would be mitigated in response to reports of finds	Same as Alternative A, but would require assessment and mitigation in all Condition 1 areas and in Condition 2 areas as needed	Assessment of fossil resources would be required on a case-by-case basis; mitigation would be required as necessary before and/or during surface disturbance.
Information on fossils and collecting rules would be provided to public through websites, publications, and personal contacts.	Same as Alternative D.	Interest groups and public land users would be contacted to provide information about fossils and appropriate uses. Condition 1 areas that receive high levels of development or visitor use would be identified and monitored.	Reports of theft or damage to fossil resources would be responded to.
Written and web-based information would be provided about fossils, hobby collecting, and local interpretive sites.	Same as Alternative D.	New websites and publications would be developed and maintained to promote visitor education. BLM would assist in development of local museum exhibits on paleontology.	Written information about fossils and hobby fossil collecting would be provided.
Paleontological Resources Use permits would be issued for scientific study, promoting or supporting investigations in poorly known areas.	Same as Alternative D.	Same as Alternative A, but BLM would support investigations in lesser-known areas and in areas where surface disturbance is occurring or anticipated.	Paleontological Resource Use permits for scientific study would be issued.
Collection of common invertebrate and plant fossils would be allowed for personal, non-commercial use. Areas for hobby collection would be identified, publicized, and monitored.	Same as Alternative D.	Same as Alternative A, but areas with rare and significant invertebrate and plant fossils would be closed to hobby collection.	Collection of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, non-commercial use would be allowed.
Rangeland Improvements			
Part or all of the following measures would be implemented to meet resource objectives for habitat enhancement:	Part or all of the following measures would be implemented to meet resource objectives for habitat enhancement:	Part or all of the following measures would be implemented to meet resource objectives for habitat enhancement:	Part or all of the following measures would be implemented to meet resource objectives for habitat enhancement:

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Vegetation Treatment (Acres).....34,640 Fencing (Miles.....68.5 <u>Water Developments:</u> Guzzlers/Reservoirs (#) .....812 Wells/Springs (#).....51 Pipeline (Miles).....37.5	Vegetation Treatment (Acres).....50,900 Fencing (Miles).....368.5 <u>Water Developments:</u> Guzzlers/Reservoirs (#).....1,165 Wells/Springs (#).....78 Pipeline (Miles).....51	Vegetation Treatment (Acres) ..... 45,860 Fencing (Miles)..... 129 <u>Water Developments:</u> Guzzlers/Reservoirs (#)..... 811 Wells/Springs (#) ..... 87 Pipeline (Miles)..... 29.5	Vegetation Treatment (Acres) ..... 40,390 Fencing (Miles) ..... 65 <u>Water Developments:</u> Guzzlers/Reservoirs (#)..... 775 Wells/Springs (#) ..... 74 Pipeline (Miles) 35
Recreation – Figure 21			
Seep Ridge, Book Cliff Divide, and Atchee Ridge Roads would be designated as BLM Back Country Byways and appropriate interpretive and educational literature and signage would be developed.	Same as Alternative A.	Seep Ridge, Book Cliff Divide, and Atchee Ridge Roads would not be designated as a Back Country Byways.	Unspecified.
24,183 acres along the White River from where the river enters Section 12, T10S R24E to where it leaves section 18, T10S R23E would be managed as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). An integrated activity plan would be developed and implemented. In the recreational portion of the plan, some of the following uses would be provided for: canoeing, rafting, camping, wildlife viewing, hunting, fishing, historic interpretation, and day hiking. (This would not exclude other recreational opportunities.)	Same as Alternative D.	47,130 acres along the White River from where the river enters Utah to the reservation boundary would be managed as a SRMA. An integrated activity plan would be developed and implemented. In the recreational portion of the plan, some of the following uses would be provided for: canoeing, rafting, camping, wildlife viewing, hunting, fishing, historic interpretation, and day hiking. (This would not exclude other recreational opportunities.)	Recreational use with minimal management oversight would continue to be provided for.
42,758 acres on Blue Mountain would be managed as a SRMA and an integrated activity plan would be developed and implemented. In the recreation portion of the plan the following uses would be emphasized: hang-gliding (competitive and special events), wildlife viewing, small and big game hunting, sight seeing, photography, equestrian use, camping, hiking, rock climbing, historic interpretation, and OHV use on designated routes. (This would not exclude other recreational opportunities.)	Blue Mountain would not be managed as a SRMA and an integrated activity plan would not be developed and implemented.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
An activity management plan would be prepared for Fantasy Canyon (69 acres) to protect the unique geological formations and to address health and human safety considerations.	Fantasy Canyon would not be managed as an SRMA nor have an activity management plan prepared for it.	69 acres in Fantasy Canyon would be managed as a SRMA to provide for the following uses: guided or self-guided tours, hiking, and interpretation.	Unspecified.
273,486 acres in the Book Cliffs would be managed as a SRMA and an integrated activity plan would be developed and implemented to maintain a frontier mystique of adventure and discovery (unconfined recreation, limited facilities). The recreational portion of the plan would provide for the following uses: wildlife viewing, hunting, hiking, back packing, OHV use, camping, cultural values including petroglyph viewing, picnicking, mountain biking, photography, back country horse riding, and visits to turn of the century homesteads.	Same as Alternative D.	Same as Alternative A except Wolf Point, Bitter Creek drainages, and the head of Sweetwater Canyon would be closed to leasing.	Unlimited and unconfined recreation would continue to be provided for.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
52,720 acres in Browns Park would be managed as a SRMA to provide for outstanding scenic vistas and enhancement of resources and associated activities such as, riparian, fisheries, special status species, water quality, water-based recreation, hunting, comprehensive trail system for hiking, biking, horseback riding, and OHV use, camping, cultural and historic interpretation and facility development The south side of the river between Little Hole and Fire Flat extending around the Taylor Flat subdivision to Rye Grass Draw in the east would be managed for primitive recreation values, VRM I, and closed to surface disturbing activities, except for activities that complement recreation values. Additionally, the area would be closed to OHV use. The historic wagon route in Sears Canyon would be evaluated and analyzed along with other routes, i.e. Crouse Canyon and Rye Grass to determine if an opportunity exists to provide a loop route for OHV use.	Same as Alternative D.	Same as Alternative A.	18,474 acres in Browns Park would continue to be managed as a SRMA that would provide for outstanding scenic, riparian, fisheries, special status species resource values, water quality, water based recreation, hunting, comprehensive trail system for hiking, biking, horseback riding, and OHV use, camping, cultural and historic interpretation and facility development.
Recreation (continued)			
81,168 acres in Nine-Mile Canyon would be managed as a SRMA to protect high-value cultural resources and scenic vistas.	Same as Alternative D.	Same as Alternative A.	Nine-Mile Canyon (44,181 acres) would continue to be managed as a SRMA to protect high-value cultural resources and scenic vistas.
RECREATION – TRAIL MAINTENANCE AND DEVELOPMENT			
Up to 400 miles of hiking, horseback riding, and mechanized (non-motorized) trails would be signed, improved, and/or developed in the following areas: the Green River, Dry Fork, Willow Creek, Nine Mile, Home Mountain, Devils Hole, Ely/Rainbow Park, Yellow Pine, Spitzenberg/Warren Ridge, Centennial Book Cliffs Trail, Rat Hole Canyon, Burnt Timber Canyon, Boulevard Ridge, Bitter Creek, Westwater Point, Chipeta Canyon, Taylor Canyon, Little Mountain, Daniels Canyon, and other additional trails.	Hiking, horseback riding, and mechanized (non-motorized) trails would not be developed.	Same as Alternative A.	About 55 miles of hiking and/or horseback trails would be developed along the Green River and on Dry Fork, Ashley Creek, Beaver, Willow, Nine Mile, and other places in the resource area. Approximately 2 miles of mountain bicycle trails would be established using existing rural road and trails. A non-motorized trail along Sears Canyon would be established.
Up to 800 miles of motorized trails would be signed, improved, and/or developed.	Same as Alternative A.	Up to 800 miles of motorized trails would not be improved and/or developed.	The Red Mountain trail would be managed and maintained as a motorized trail.
OHV use for big game retrieval off designated routes would not be allowed.	Big game retrieval off designated routes would be allowed within 24 hours after a tag has been punched. (Limited to one vehicle.)	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
BLM would work in conjunction with the National Park Service and energy companies to minimize noise and light pollution adjacent to Dinosaur National Monument using best available technology, such as installation of multi-cylinder pumps, hospital sound-reducing mufflers, and placement of exhaust systems to direct noise away from the monument. Additionally, there would be a requirement to reduce light pollution by using methods such as limiting height of light poles, timing of lighting operations (meaning limiting lighting to times of darkness associated with	Same as Alternative A.	BLM would work in conjunction with the National Park Service and energy companies to minimize noise and light pollution adjacent to Dinosaur National Monument using best available technology, such as installation of multi-cylinder pumps, hospital sound-reducing mufflers, and placement of exhaust systems to direct noise away from the monument. Additionally, there would be a requirement to reduce light pollution by using methods such as limiting height of light poles, timing of lighting operations (meaning limiting lighting to times of darkness associated with	Unspecified.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES			
Alternative A	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D Current Management (no action)**
drilling and work over or maintenance operations), limiting wattage intensity, and constructing light shields. Movement of operations to mitigate sound and light impacts would be required to be at least 200 meters from the Monument boundary for VRM Classes II, III and IV, unless otherwise designated by oil and gas leasing category or a determination is made that natural barriers or view sheds would meet these mitigation objectives.		drilling and work over or maintenance operations), limiting wattage intensity, and constructing light shields. Oil and Gas leasing categories would be NSO for one-half mile from the monument boundary. VRM Class designations would be I, II, and III.	
Recreation –Trail Maintenance and Development (continued)			
Additional cabins for permitted/administrative use would be constructed at or near the existing Chipeta, Trujillo, Moonshine, Rat Hole, and Wolf Den cabins and at Westwater Point, Dick Canyon, and other locations.	Same as Alternative A.	Additional cabins in the Book Cliffs would not be constructed.	Unspecified.
Riparian			
The following management strategies would be employed in riparian areas that are not achieving proper functioning condition: Key streamside herbaceous riparian vegetation, where stream bank stability is dependant upon it, would have a minimum stubble height at the end of the growing season capable of trapping and assuring retention of sediment during high flows. Management actions could be based on residual stubble height or utilization of current year's growth at the end of the growing season. An initial management action would be to set a stubble height of 4 inches or 30% utilization on key species if riparian conditions in that reach are to be maintained and 6 inches or <20% utilization if riparian conditions need to be improved. This initial stubble height or utilization level would need to be monitored to verify if it provides for maintenance or improvement objectives, with adjustments in allowable utilization or stubble height being made as needed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Diamond Mountain: Where grazing is allowed on riparian areas, the objective would be to maintain an average minimum herbage stubble height of 3 inches after livestock grazing in order to provide sufficient herbaceous biomass to meet requirements of plant, vigor, maintenance, bank protection, and sediment entrapment. Book Cliffs: Unspecified.
Key herbaceous riparian vegetation in riparian areas, other than the stream banks, would not be grazed more than would allow for trapping and retention of sediment during high water events. Management actions would be based on residual stubble height or utilization of current year’s growth at the end of the growing season. An initial management action that has been shown to obtain riparian goals is to set a stubble height of 4 inches or 30% utilization if riparian conditions in that reach are to be maintained and 6 inches or <20% utilization if riparian conditions need to be improved. This initial stubble height or utilization level would need to be monitored to verify if it provides for maintenance or improvement objectives, with adjustments in allowable utilization or stubble height being made as needed.	Key herbaceous riparian vegetation in riparian areas, other than the stream banks, would not be grazed more than 50% during the growing season, or 60% during the dormant season.	Same as Alternative A.	Diamond Mountain: Where grazing is allowed on riparian areas, the objective would be to maintain an average minimum herbage stubble height of 3 inches after livestock grazing in order to provide sufficient herbaceous biomass to meet requirements of plant, vigor, maintenance, bank protection, and sediment entrapment. Book Cliffs: Unspecified.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Riparian (continued)			
Key riparian woody vegetation would not be browsed more than allows for the adequate recruitment to maintain or recover the woody component. Specifically, more plants in the combined sprout and young categories would be managed for than in the combined mature and dead categories. Management action would be based on utilization of the current annual twig growth that is within reach of the animals. An initial management action that has been shown to obtain riparian goals is to set a woody vegetation utilization level of 30%. The specific utilization would need to be monitored to verify if it provides for maintenance or improvement objectives, with adjustments in allowable utilization being made as needed.	Key riparian woody vegetation would not be used more than 50% of the current annual twig growth that is within reach of the animals.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
Soil and Water Resources			
The "Surface Operating Standards for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development" (Gold Book), would be used as a guide for surface disturbing proposals on steep slopes/hillsides. Specific to oil and gas activities, steep hillsides should be avoided in the construction of roads, pipelines, and flowlines. If surface disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes 21-40%, an approved plan would be required prior to construction and maintenance that would include: • An erosion control strategy • GIS modeling • Proper survey and design by a certified engineer For slopes greater than 40%, no surface disturbance would be allowed unless it is determined that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives.	The "Surface Operating Standards for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development" (Gold Book), would be used as a guide for surface disturbing proposals on steep slopes/hillsides. Specific to oil and gas activities, steep hillsides should be avoided in the construction of roads, pipelines, and flowlines. If surface disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes greater than 20%, an approved plan would be required prior to construction and maintenance that would include: • An erosion control strategy • GIS modeling • Proper survey and design by a certified engineer	The "Surface Operating Standards for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development" (Gold Book), would be used as a guide for surface disturbing proposals on steep slopes/hillsides. Specific to oil and gas activities, steep hillsides should be avoided in the construction of roads, pipelines, and flowlines. If surface disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes 21-40%, an approved plan would be required prior to construction and maintenance that would include: • An erosion control strategy • GIS modeling • Proper survey and design by a certified engineer No surface disturbance would be allowed on slopes greater that 40%.	For minerals only, no occupancy or other surface disturbance would be allowed on slopes in excess of 40%.
Old fields would be irrigated and existing ditches and diversion structures would be restored on acquired lands in Bitter Creek and Rat Hole Drainages.	Old fields in Bitter Creek and Rat Hole Drainages would not be irrigated.	Same as Alternative A plus new ditches and diversion structures constructed as well.	Unspecified.
Special Designations – Figures 22-24			
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACECs)			
68,834 acres referred to as Bitter Creek would be designated as an ACEC/Research Natural Area to protect high-value, old-growth pinyon pines, cultural resources, historical features, and watersheds. Special management actions would include the following: establishing a research/monitoring program; enhancing habitat utilizing forest manipulation and tree spraying, and restricting	Bitter Creek would not be designated as an ACEC/Research Natural Area.	147,425 acres referred to as Bitter Creek would be designated as an ACEC/Research Natural Area to protect high-value, old-growth pinion pines, cultural resources, historical features, and watersheds. Special management actions would include the following: establishing a research/monitoring program, enhancing habitat utilizing forest manipulation and tree spraying, and restricting	Not designated.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
wood-cutting around old-growth pinion. For oil and gas leasing, the area would be managed with timing and controlled surface use, except for 160 acres containing old-growth pinion pines (T13S, R25E, Section 35, SESE), which would be managed as a NSO, and the 400 acre Mountain Browse Natural Area would be closed to leasing. VRM class designations would be I, II or III, and OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes.		wood cutting around old-growth pinion. The area would managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing, except for the following areas which would be closed to leasing: the old-growth pinion pine area (T13S, R25E, Section 35, SESE), Bitter Creek drainages, and the head of Sweetwater Canyon. VRM class designations would be I, II, or III, and OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes.	
Special Designations – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) (continued)			
87,743 acres in Coyote Basin would be designated as an ACEC/Research Natural Area to protect high value critical ecosystem for the white-tailed prairie dog and the numerous special status wildlife species that are closely associated with this ecosystem. Special management attention would include controlling noxious weeds, restoring a natural fire regime, implementing actions to maintain or enhance ferret habitat and associated prey base, and establishing a research-monitoring program. The area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or managed with timing and controlled surface use. VRM class designations would be II, III, or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes.	47,659 acres in Coyote Basin would be designated as an ACEC/Research Natural Area to protect high-value critical ecosystem for the black-footed ferret. Special management attention would include actions to maintain or enhance ferret habitat and associated prey base. Special management attention would include controlling noxious weeds, restoring a natural fire regime, implementing actions to maintain or enhance ferret habitat and associated prey base, and establishing a research-monitoring program.	124,161 acres in Coyote Basin, Snake John, Shiner, and Kennedy Wash sub-complexes and the Myton Bench complex would be designated as an ACEC/Research Natural Area. The area would be subject to standard lease terms, and managed with timing and controlled surface use or NSO for oil and gas leasing. VRM class designations would be II, III or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes or closed. Special management attention would include controlling noxious weeds, restoring a natural fire regime, implementing actions to maintain or enhance ferret habitat and associated prey base, and establishing a research-monitoring program.	Not designated.
The Four Mile Wash area would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.	50,280 acres in the Four Mile Wash area would be designated as an ACEC/Outstanding Natural Area to protect high-value scenic values, riparian ecosystems, and special status fish species. An integrated activity level plan would be developed to provide additional site-specific management prescriptions. The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as class II, III, and IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes.	Unspecified.
The Middle Green River would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.	6,768 acres (line of sight from the centerline of the river up to one-half mile along both sides of the Middle Green River) between Dinosaur National Monument and the boundary of the Ouray National Wildlife Refuge would be designated as an ACEC to protect riparian ecosystems. Special management attention would include permitting surface disturbing activities found complimentary to the goals and objectives of the ACEC. The area would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or managed with timing and controlled surface use. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes.	Unspecified.
10,170 acres (line of sight from the center line of the river up to one-half mile along both sides of the Lower Green River), between the trust land boundary at Ouray National Wildlife Refuge and the Carbon County line would be designated as an ACEC to protect high-value scenic	The Lower Green River would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.	The Lower Green River along the west bank line of sight up to one-half mile would continue to be managed as an ACEC (8407 acres), between the trust land boundary at Ouray National Wildlife Refuge and the Carbon County line. Riparian values would be enhanced and protected,

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
resources and riparian ecosystems. The area would be managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II. OHV would be limited to designated routes.			Visual resources would be managed as Class II, OHV use would be limited to designated routes or closed, and surface-disturbing activities would not be allowed.
Special Designations – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) (continued)			
17,810 acres along the White River corridor would be designated as an ACEC to protect unique geologic formations with spectacular vistas and high-value river riparian ecosystems. The western portion would be managed as VRM I, closed to oil and gas leasing or NSO and closed to OHV use. The eastern portion would be managed as VRM II and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. NSO would be within line of sight from the centerline, up to one-half mile either side of the river. Areas beyond the one-half mile buffer would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms or managed with timing and controlled surface use.	The White River corridor would not be designated as an ACEC.	47,130 acres along the White River corridor would be designated as an ACEC to protect unique geologic formations with spectacular vistas and high-value river riparian ecosystems. The area would be managed as VRM I, II, III, or IV and closed or limited to designated routes for OHV use. NSO would be within line of sight from the centerline, up to one-half mile either side of the river. Areas beyond the one-half mile buffer would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard lease terms, managed with timing and controlled surface use, or closed to oil and gas leasing.	Not designated.
52,721 acres in Brown's Park would be managed as an ACEC and a comprehensive integrated activity plan would be developed/implemented that would address protection of high-value scenic views, wildlife habitat, and cultural and historic resources. The area would be closed, NSO, or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class I or II. OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes.	18,474 acres in Brown's Park would be managed as an ACEC and a comprehensive integrated activity plan would be developed/implemented that would address protection of high-value scenic views, wildlife habitat, and cultural and historic resources. The area would be open subject to standard lease terms, closed, NSO, or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class I, II, III, or IV. OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Browns Park would continue to be designated as an ACEC (52,721 acres) to protect and enhance crucial deer winter range and outstanding scenic, cultural, riparian, fisheries, and special status species resource values. The area would be open subject to standard lease terms, closed, NSO, or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class I, II, III, or IV. OHV use would be open, closed or limited to designated routes.
24,285 acres in Red Mountain-Dry Fork Complex would be managed as an ACEC and a comprehensive integrated activity plan would be developed/implemented. Special management attention would include maintenance and development of OHV or non-OHV trails, minimal facilities development necessary for human health and safety, and protection of watershed values, relict vegetation communities, and crucial deer and elk winter habitat. The area would be NSO or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III, or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes.	Same as Alternative A.	24,285 acres in Red Mountain-Dry Fork Complex would be managed as an ACEC and a comprehensive integrated activity plan would be developed/implemented. Special management attention would include maintenance and development of OHV or non-OHV trails, minimal facilities development necessary for human health and safety, and protection of watershed values, relict vegetation communities, and crucial deer and elk winter habitat. The area would be NSO, managed with timing and controlled surface use, or closed to oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III, or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes.	24,285 acres in Red Mountain-Dry Fork Complex would continue to be designated as an ACEC to protect cultural sites, paleontology, and relict vegetation, and enhance supporting wildlife habitat, municipal watersheds, riparian, and scenic resource values. The area would be NSO, or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III, or IV. OHV use would be open or limited to designated routes.
48,000 acres in Nine-Mile Canyon would be designated as an ACEC and a comprehensive integrated activity plan would be developed/implemented. The area would be open subject to standard lease terms or managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III, or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes.	Same as Alternative D.	81,168 acres in Nine-Mile Canyon would be designated as an ACEC and a comprehensive integrated activity plan would be developed/implemented. The area would be open subject to standard lease terms or managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III, or IV. OHV use would be limited to designated routes.	Nine-Mile Canyon with a boundary along the upper rim would continue to be designated as an ACEC (44,181 acres) to enhance cultural and special status plant species while enhancing scenic vistas, recreation, and wildlife resource values. Lears Canyon would continue to be managed as an ACEC (1,375 acres) to protect relict vegetation. The area would be open subject to standard lease terms, NSO, or

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
			managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class II, III, or IV. OHV use would be open, closed or limited to designated routes.
Special Designations – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) (continued)			
Main Canyon would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.	100,915 acres in Main Canyon would be designated as an ACEC. Special management attention would include permitting surface disturbing activities found to be complimentary or compatible to the goals and objectives of the ACEC. The area would be closed or managed with timing and controlled surface use for oil and gas leasing. Visual Resources would be managed as Class I or II. OHV use would be closed or limited to designated routes.	Not designated.
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS			
The segment of the White River from where the river enters Section 11 of T10S, R24E, to Asphalt Wash would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of “Scenic”. The segment of the White River, between Asphalt Wash to where the river leaves Section 18 of T10S, R23E, would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of “Wild”.	The White River would not be identified as a “Wild and Scenic” river.	The segment of the White River, between the Colorado state line and the trust land boundary (44 miles) would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of: (1) ‘Scenic’ between the state line and its confluence with Asphalt Wash; (2) ‘Wild’ between Asphalt Wash to where the river leaves Section 18 T10S R23E SLBM, and (3) ‘Scenic’ from where the river leaves Section 18 T10S R23E SLBM, and the Indian trust land boundary.	Under this alternative, suitability findings would not be made and eligibility would continue with BLM applying protective management to the free flowing nature, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification of the river.
The segment of Nine-Mile Creek within Duchesne County between the Green River and the Duchesne County Line (13 miles) would not be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system.	. Same as Alternative A.	The segment of Nine-Mile Creek within Duchesne County between the Green River and the Duchesne County Line (13 miles) would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of “scenic”.	Considered but not found suitable in the Diamond Mountain. RMP.
The segment of Nine-Mile Creek within Duchesne County between the Carbon county line and its confluence with Gate Canyon would not be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system.	Same as Alternative A.	The segment of Nine-Mile Creek within Duchesne County, between the Carbon county line (6 miles) and its confluence with Gate Canyon, would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of “Recreational”.	Considered but not found suitable in the Diamond Mountain. RMP.
The segment of the Middle Green River, between SR-45 and the boundary of the Ouray National Waterfowl Refuge would not be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system.	Same as Alternative A.	The segment of the Middle Green River, from Dinosaur National Monument to the boundary of the Ouray National Waterfowl Refuge (36 miles), would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of “Recreational”.	Considered but not found suitable in the Diamond Mountain. RMP.
The segment of Evacuation Creek between the Utah state line and the White River would not be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system.	Same as Alternative A.	The segment of Evacuation Creek between the Utah state line and the White River (21 miles) would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of “Scenic”.	Under this alternative, suitability findings would not be made and eligibility would continue with BLM applying protective management to the free flowing nature, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification of the river.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
The segment of Bitter Creek between the Utah state line and where it enters private property would not be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system.	Same as Alternative A.	The segment of Bitter Creek between the Utah state line and where it enters private property (22 miles) would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of "Scenic".	Under this alternative, suitability findings would not be made and eligibility would continue with BLM applying protective management to the free flowing nature, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classification of the river.
Special Designation – Wild and Scenic Rivers (continued)			
The segment of Argyle Creek between its headwaters and the Carbon county line would not be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of "Recreational".	Same as Alternative A.	The segment of Argyle Creek between its headwaters and the Carbon county line (22 miles) would be identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River system with a tentative classification of "Recreational".	Considered but not found suitable for designation in the Diamond Mountain RMP.
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS – WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS – IF RELEASED BY CONGRESS If the existing WSAs are released from wilderness consideration and management by Congress during the life of the RMP, the following prescriptions would determine how these lands would be managed.			
Book Cliffs Mountain Browse ISA			
Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Book Cliffs SRMA and Bitter Creek ACEC • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class II • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Book Cliffs SRMA • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class IV • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: Same as Alternative A	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category no leasing • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class I • Livestock grazing
Bull Canyon			
Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category D • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class III • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category D • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class IV • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category D • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class II • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category no leasing • OHV limited to designated routes • VRM Class I • Closed to woodcutting • Livestock grazing
Daniels Canyon			
Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • OHVs limited to designated routes	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas timing and controlled surface use • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class IV	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas timing and controlled surface use • Closed to OHV use • VRM Class II	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category no leasing • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class I

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
• VRM Class II • Livestock grazing	• Livestock grazing	• Livestock grazing	• Livestock grazing
Special Designations – Wilderness Study Areas – If Released by Congress (continued)			
Diamond Breaks			
Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Browns Park SRMA and ACEC • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class II • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Browns Park ACEC • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class IV • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Browns Park SRMA and ACEC • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class III • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category no leasing • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class I • Closed to woodcutting • Livestock grazing
West Cold Spring			
Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category B • Oil and Gas lease category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Browns Park SRMA and ACEC • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class II • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category B • Oil and Gas lease category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Browns Park ACEC • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class IV • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: Same as Alternative A	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category B • Oil and gas lease category no leasing • closed to OHV use • VRM Class I • Closed to woodcutting • Livestock grazing
Winter Ridge			
Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Book Cliffs SRMA • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class III • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class IV • Available for woodcutting • Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category timing and controlled surface use • As part of the Book Cliffs SRMA and Main Canyon ACEC • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class II • Available for woodcutting Livestock grazing	Manage lands in the WSA according to the following prescription: • Fire management category C • Oil and gas category no leasing • OHVs limited to designated routes • VRM Class I • Closed to woodcutting • Livestock grazing

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Special Status Species			
RAPTORS			
Buffers:			
Raptors would be managed under the auspices of Best Management Practices (BMPs) (see Appendix A), which would include implementation of spatial and seasonal buffers comparable to the USFWS's Guidelines for Raptor Protection From Human and Land Use Disturbances, with modifications allowed as long as protection of nests is ensured. Seasonal and spatial buffers (including USFWS's) are listed in Appendix H.	Raptors would be managed at a level less restrictive than the USFWS guidelines. Protections for nests of threatened and endangered raptor species and ferruginous hawks would include implementation of spatial buffers comparable to the USFWS guidelines with modifications allowed as long as protection of nests is insured. Seasonable buffers would generally be less restrictive. Other raptor species would be provided protection at a level less than recommended in the USFWS guidelines. Seasonal and spatial buffers for raptor nests are listed in Appendix H.	USFWS's spatial and seasonal buffers would be implemented for raptors as recommended in Table 2 of the Utah Field Office Guidelines For Raptor Protection From Human and Land Use Disturbances.	Book Cliffs: Unspecified Diamond Mountain: Spatial and seasonal buffers listed in the Diamond Mountain RMP would continue to be applied to twenty special status or sensitive raptor species. (See Appendix H.)
Nest Protection for Raptors			
Unoccupied Nests: All Activities, Including New Oil and Gas Leases: Nests would be protected for a period of seven years yet allow for permanent (long-term) facilities and structures to be constructed outside of the breeding season as long as they would not cause the nest site to become unsuitable for future nesting. Non-permanent (short-term) activities would be allowed within the spatial buffer of nests during the nesting season as long as those activities are shown to be non-impacting to nesting raptors. Existing Oil and Gas leases: Bald eagle, golden eagle, peregrine falcon, ferruginous hawk, and burrowing owl nests would be protected for two years by not allowing permanent surface disturbing activities during the breeding season. Permanent surface disturbing activities would be allowed outside of the seasonal buffer within the spatial buffer as long as the activity would not cause the nest site to become unsuitable for future nesting. Non-permanent (short-term) activities would be allowed within the spatial buffer of nests during the nesting season as long as those activities are shown to be non-impacting to nesting raptors.	Unoccupied Nests: All Activities, Including New and existing Oil and Gas Leases: For T&E species and ferruginous hawks, nests would be protected for a period of three years yet allow for facilities and structures to be constructed outside of the temporary spatial and seasonal buffers. However, new or additional surface occupancy would not be allowed within one-quarter mile of nests. For all other raptor nests, a temporary buffer zone would be provided within one-quarter mile between February 15 and August 1st.	Unoccupied Nests: All Activities, Including New Oil and Gas Leases: For long-term land use activities, nests should be protected for seven years and such activities should not occur proximally to unoccupied nests unless it is determined that mitigation is appropriate. Short-term land use and human activities could progress near a nest or nest territory after sufficient time has elapsed in a specific breeding season to determine a nest is unoccupied and prior to the beginning of the next year's breeding season Existing Oil and Gas leases: Same as Alternative D.	Unoccupied Nests: All Activities, Including New Oil and Gas Leases: a) Golden Eagle Nests - active within two years No construction or surface disturbing activities would be allowed which would adversely affect current use or limit or preclude potential future use of the nest, unless a permit to take is obtained from the USFWS. b) Known Peregrine Falcon, Ferruginous Hawk and Bald Eagle Nests — No construction or surface disturbing activities would be allowed year 'round. The above restrictions for golden eagle, peregrine falcon, ferruginous hawk, and bald eagle nests would not apply to maintenance and operation of existing facilities. Existing Oil and Gas leases: Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle, Peregrine Falcon, Ferruginous Hawk and Burrowing Owl nests would be protected for two years, during which time permanent disturbances would not occur within the spatial buffer; non-permanent activities would be allowed within the spatial buffer, but outside the seasonal buffer.
Occupied Nests: All leases: Long-term land use activities that would have an adverse impact would not be allowed within the spatial buffer of occupied nests. Short-term land use activities would be allowed outside the breeding/nesting period within the spatial buffer of nests.	Occupied Nests: All leases: For T&E raptor species and ferruginous hawk nests, new or additional surface occupancy would not be authorized within one-half mile of nests between February 15 through August 1st. Additionally there would be NSO within one-quarter mile of occupied nests. For all other raptor species, new or additional surface occupancy would not be authorized within ¼ mile of nests between Feb. 15th and Aug. 1st.	Occupied Nests: All leases: Activities would not occur within the spatial/seasonal buffer of any nest. Short-term land use and human use activities would only proceed within the spatial buffer of an occupied nest outside the seasonal buffer after coordination with appropriate agency biologists. Long-term land use activities and human use activities would not occur within the species-specific spatial buffer of nests.	Occupied Nests: All leases: Book Cliffs: Unspecified. Diamond Mountain: Surface-disturbing activities would not be allowed within the specified distances of an active golden eagle, bald eagle, peregrine falcon, or ferruginous hawk nest year 'round. Surface disturbing activities within the specified distances of an active nest site would not be allowed within the specified active reproductive periods for the following raptor species: burrowing owl, osprey,

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
			Swainson's hawk, northern goshawk, short-eared owl, prairie falcon, merlin, American kestrel, turkey vulture, Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, northern harrier, red-tailed hawk, great horned owl, long-eared owl, and Mexican spotted owl.
Special Status Species –Nest Protection for Raptors (continued)			
Modifications to the spatial and seasonal buffers would be made in accordance with the criteria in the VFO's BMPs summarized as: • completion of a Site-Specific Assessment form; • written documentation by the BLM Field Office Biologist confirming that implementation of the modifications would not impact the success of the nest or the suitability of the site for future nesting; and • monitoring, which would include strategy employment and implementation of a post-project/mitigation plan.	Once T&E species and ferruginous hawks have occupied a nest, the temporary buffers could be waived on an alternate unoccupied nest within the territory after verification by a qualified biologist and approval by the authorized officer. For all other raptor species, protection could be waived once young are in the nest, depending on proximity and type of disturbance. If no nesting activity is initiated during the breeding season, the buffers could be waived by the authorized officer.	Same as Alternative A.	Book Cliffs: Unspecified. Diamond Mountain: A site-specific analysis would be completed to determine if terrain features adequately protect the nest site from a proposed surface-disturbing activity.
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES – BLM SENSITIVE			
Colorado River Cutthroat Trout			
Per the Conservation Agreement/Conservation and Sportfishing Management Strategy for the Colorado River Cutthroat Trout, habitat would be provided, maintained and/or enhanced in Bitter, Upper Willow, Beaver, Sears, Crouse, Tolivers, Davenport, Jackson, and Sweetwater Creeks, including tributaries for the reintroduction of Colorado River cutthroat trout.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Suitable habitat would be provided and maintained to reintroduce Colorado River cutthroat trout in Upper Willow (Brown's Park), Beaver, Sears, Crouse, Tolivers, Davenport, Jackson, and Argyle Creeks as found applicable.
Sage Grouse			
The Strategic Management Plan For Sage Grouse, State of Utah June 11, 2002, would be adopted and implemented as the baseline threshold. Human disturbances would be avoided within 0.6 mile of a lek during the breeding season (March 1 to May 31) from one hour before sunrise to three hours after sunrise, and construction of roads, fences, poles, and utility lines would be avoided within 1,300 feet of a lek. Exception(s): Livestock, wildlife, and wild horse use would be managed to achieve and maintain sagebrush and riparian/meadow habitats in good ecological condition per the BLM May 1997 Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management.	Significant human disturbances would be avoided within 0.6 mile of a lek during the breeding season (March 1-May 31) from one hour before sunrise to three hours after sunrise. Construction of roads, fences, poles, and utility lines would be avoided within 1,300 feet of a lek. Any developments within the 1,300 feet would be designed to minimize, to the extent possible, bird structure collision and to prevent raptor perching. Any development within two miles of a lek would be designed to minimize, to the extent possible, raptor perching.	Connelly's Guidelines to Manage Sage Grouse Populations and Their Habitats, which recommends no surface disturbing activities within two miles of active sage grouse leks from March 1 to June 15 and no surface disturbing activities within one-quarter mile of active sage grouse leks year round, would be implemented. No permanent facilities or structures would be allowed within two miles when possible.	Book Cliffs: For minerals only, surface disturbance, exploration, drilling, and other development activity would be allowed only during the period from June 15 to March 15, and no drilling or storage facilities would be allowed within 300 feet of the sage grouse leks. Diamond Mountain: Surface-disturbing activities would not be allowed within sage grouse nesting areas (a two-mile radius of sage grouse strutting grounds within the sagebrush vegetation type) from March 1 through June 30 (identified as 88,500 acres in management priority area III). Surface-disturbing activities would not be allowed within 1,000 feet of sage grouse leks.
Within 0.5 mile of known active leks, the best available technology would be used to reduce noise, such as installation of multi-cylinder pumps, hospital sound-reducing mufflers, and placement of exhaust systems.	Special measures to reduce noise would not be required.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Travel – Roads and Trails – Figures 25-28			
The Chipeta Canyon road would be open up to Chipeta cabin.	Same as Alternative A.	The Chipeta Canyon road would be closed at the mouth of Chipeta Canyon.	Unspecified.
Newly permitted roads or trails would be obliterated and/or returned to their original condition when they no longer serve their permitted purpose or public interest.	Newly permitted roads or trails would not be obliterated if the road or trail serves a public interest.	Newly permitted roads or trails would be obliterated when they no longer serve their permitted purpose.	Unspecified.
Roads and trails causing resource damage would be repaired by maintenance, upgrade, or realignment. BLM roads would be closed if none of the above is economically feasible.	Roads and trails causing resource damage would be maintained, upgraded, and/or realigned.	Roads and trails causing resource damage would be maintained, upgraded, realigned, and/or closed.	Unspecified.
OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed except for managed open areas. Acres that would be open to OHV travel:.....6,202 Acres that would be limited to OHV travel: .....1,643,475 Acres that would be closed to OHV travel: .....75,845 Miles of routes that would be designated to OHV travel: 4,860	OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed except for managed open areas. Acres that would be open to OHV travel:.....5,434 Acres that would be limited to OHV travel:.....1,659,901 Acres that would be closed to OHV travel:.....60,187 Miles of routes that would be designated to OHV travel: 4,861	OHV travel would be limited to designated routes or closed except for managed open areas. Acres that would be open to OHV travel: ..... 5,434 Acres that would be limited to OHV travel:..... 1,353,529 Acres that would be closed to OHV travel:..... 366,559 Miles of routes that would be designated to OHV travel: 4,707	OHV travel would be open, limited to designated routes, or closed. Acres that would be open to OHV travel: ..... 787,859 Acres that would be limited to OHV travel:..... 887,275 Acres that would be closed to OHV travel:..... 50,388 Miles of routes not designated.
Visual Resource Management – Figures 29-32			
67,357 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.	56,127 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.	148,260 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.	56,127 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.
446,287 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	230,674 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	620,630 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	230,330 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.
1,091,814 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.	300,376 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.	861,281 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.	300,656 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.
868,542 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	1,886,822 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	843,829 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	1,886,887 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.
Wild Horses – Figure 33			
BONANZA			
Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative D.	The Book Cliffs Resource Management Plan Amendment Involving the Bonanza Wild Horse Herd Area would be implemented.
Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	A herd of 40 horses would be re-established. Physical and conformation characteristics would be established under the Herd Area Management Plan.	A herd of 40 horses, allowing for a maximum of 85, would be re-established that would have the following physical and conformation characteristics: • Color - bay, buckskin, palomino, red and blue roan, brown, dunn, sorrel, black, and grulla. • Markings - Spanish mustang indicators, such as dorsal and zebra stripes. • Size - 13 to 15 hands high and weighing 800 to 1,000 pounds. • Breed-mixed, including Appaloosa and Spanish mustang.
Do not maintain Herd Management Area (HMA).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative D.	The HMA would be maintained with horses.
Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative D.	Establish an AML of 85 wild horses with a minimum herd of 40. Adjustments in the interim AML would be in accordance with criteria outlined under the Forage section.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES			
Alternative A	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D Current Management (no action)**
Wild Horses – Bonanza (continued)			
Gap fences would not be constructed.	Same as Alternative A.	Would be determined under the Herd Area Management Plan.	Three miles of gap fences would be constructed where cliffs on the north rim of the White River would not provide natural barriers. Cattle guards would be placed on roads where needed to ensure integrity of the fences.
Additional water developments would not be provided for wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Would be determined under the Herd Area Management Plan.	25 additional water developments consisting of a combination of reservoirs, shallow wells, and guzzlers would be provided.
Up to 15 reservoirs outside of, but in close proximity to, the Herd Area (HA) boundary would not be fenced.	Same as Alternative A.	Would be determined under the Herd Area Management Plan.	Up to 15 reservoirs outside of, but in close proximity to, the HA boundary would be fenced.
Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative D.	A gathering plan would be prepared and approximately 45 horses would be removed every four years; gathered horses would be available for adoption under BLM's Adopt-A-Horse program.
Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as alternative A.	Same as Alternative D.	A Wild Horse Herd Area Management Plan would be prepared within three years after the Record of Decision (ROD) is signed.
WINTER RIDGE			
An AML of 50 to 100 horses would be established. The herd would not be reduced below 50. Adjustments in the AML would be accordance with criteria outlined under the forage section.	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	An AML would not be established.
A gathering plan would be prepared and an estimated 50 horses would be removed approximately every four years; gathered horses would be available for adoption under BLM's Adopt -A-Horse program.	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	A gathering plan would be prepared and the herd would be removed. Gathered horses would be available for adoption under BLM's Adopt -A-Horse program.
The HA would be designated as a HMA.	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	The HA would not be designated as a HMA.
A Wild Horse Herd Management Area /Monitoring Plan would be prepared after the ROD is signed.	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	A Wild Horse Herd Management Area/Monitoring Plan would not be prepared.
HILL CREEK			
Same as Alternative D.	All wild horses would be removed, the area would be declared unpopulated, and the HMA designation would be removed. The area would only be managed as a HA with no specific management plan for wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Would be managed as a wild horse HMA.
An AML of 70 to 145 horses would be established with a minimum herd of 70. A management objective would be to manage for a 100 animal wild horse herd.	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	An AML of 195 horses would be continued; minimum herd size would be unspecified.
No horse grazing permits would be issued on public lands within the HMA or immediate areas to grazing permittees, including the Northern Ute Tribe.	A horse grazing permit or permits would be offered on the public lands within the Hill Creek HA (Figure 33) to the Northern Ute Tribe. The permit or permits could collectively total up to a 1,200 AUM allocation for up to 100 tribal horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
A Nation-to-Nation agreement with the Northern Ute Tribe and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with adjacent private property owners would be entered into for	A Nation-to-Nation agreement with the Northern Ute Tribe and a MOU with adjacent private property owners would be entered into for range improvements, i.e., fences (for	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
range improvements, i.e., fences (for key areas of management concern) and for wild horse and tribal horse management.	key areas of management concern) and for tribal horse management		
Wild Horses – Hill Creek (continued)			
A gathering plan would be prepared every four years and approximately 75 horses would be removed and made available for adoption under BLM's Adopt -A-Horse program.	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
The boundaries of the Herd Management Area would be extended to include the north end of Wild Horse Bench (approximately 30,347 acres) and Big Pack Mountain (approximately 22,865 acres).	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Herd Management Area boundaries would be continued as identified in 1971.
A Wild Horse Herd Management Area Plan would be prepared after the ROD is signed.	Not applicable. No wild horses.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
Wildlife and Fisheries			
No surface disturbing activities would be allowed from April 15 to May 31 within McCook and Monument Ridge mule deer migration corridors (Figure 34).	Same as Alternative A.	No surface disturbing activities would be allowed from April 15 to May 31 and September 1 to October 15 within McCook and Monument Ridge mule deer migration corridors (Figure 34).	For minerals only, no surface disturbing activities would be allowed within the Monument Ridge mule deer migration corridor from May 11-May 31 and within the McCook Ridge mule deer migration corridor from October 2-May 31.
Habitat and forage would be provided for the emigration and/or reintroduction of Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep in the following areas: Upper Book Cliffs (Willow Creek drainage upstream from Wood Canyon and the Bitter Creek drainage upstream from the Sweetwater confluence), White River, Browns Park/Green River Corridor that includes Red Creek Canyon, Sears Creek Canyon, Crouse Canyon, Toliver's Creek, Beaver Creek/Willow Creek Area, Goslin Mountain, Teepee Mountain, Big Brush Creek, Little Brush Creek, Ashley Gorge, ridge tops on Diamond Mountain, Richard's Mountain, and the Island Park /Dry Fork area and Nine-Mile Canyon. Forage required for Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep would be included in the AUMs allocated for wildlife.	Same as Alternative A except BLM would only support Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep if natural emigration occurs.	Same as Alternative A.	Book Cliffs: Suitable habitat exists for bighorn sheep. Diamond Mountain: Bighorn sheep would be re-established in Browns Park. Forage and cover would be provided to annually support an average population of about 300-400 animals on public lands in the HMP area.
Habitat and forage would be provided for the emigration and/or reintroduction of bison in the Southern Book Cliffs. Forage required for bison would be included in the AUMs allocated for wildlife.	BLM would not support bison in the Southern Book Cliffs.	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
Habitat and forage would be provided for the emigration and/or reintroduction of moose populations. Forage required for moose would be included in the AUMs allocated for wildlife.	BLM would not support moose in the Upper Book Cliffs	Same as Alternative A.	Unspecified.
Disturbance within sagebrush habitat on crucial deer winter range would be reclaimed or enhanced at a ratio of 1.5:1.	Disturbance within sagebrush habitat on crucial deer winter range would be reclaimed at or enhanced at a ratio of 1:1.	Disturbance within sagebrush habitat on crucial deer winter range would be reclaimed or enhanced at a ratio of 3:1.	Unspecified.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (no action)
Wildlife and Fisheries (continued)			
Activities that would result in adverse impacts to deer and elk within crucial winter range would not be allowed from November 15 to April 30. This restriction would not apply if it is determined through analysis and coordination with UDWR that impacts could be mitigated. Factors to be considered would include snow depth, temperature, snow crusting, location of disturbance, forage quantity and quality, animal condition, and expected duration of disturbance.	Disturbance activities would not be allowed from December 15 to March 15 that would displace deer and elk from more than 10% of their total winter habitat at any given time. Waivers would be granted if deer and elk are not present, topography or other attributes screen the activity sufficiently so that the proposed activity would not displace the subject species, or disturbance resulting from the proposed activity could be mitigated.	Same as Alternative A.	Book Cliffs: In order to protect crucial winter elk habitat, surface-disturbing activities would not be allowed from November 1 to March 31. No surface disturbing activities would be allowed on McCook Ridge October 2 to May 31 to protect the crucial winter deer and elk habitat. Diamond Mountain: Activities that would result in adverse impacts to deer and elk within crucial winter range would not be allowed from December 1 to April 30. This restriction would not apply if deer and/or elk are not present, or impacts could be mitigated through other management actions.
New surface disturbance of up to 560 acres per township would be allowed, prorated based on the percentage of the crucial deer winter range within the township.	Within crucial deer winter range, no more than 10% of such habitat would be subject to surface disturbance and remain un-reclaimed at any given time. The 10% threshold would apply only to new disturbances.	Total surface disturbance (new and existing) of 560 acres per township would be allowed, prorated based on percentage of the crucial deer winter range within the township.	Unspecified.
Woodlands and Forests – Figure 36			
Forests and woodlands would be managed to maintain and restore ecosystems to a condition in which biodiversity is preserved and occurrences of fire, insects, disease and other disturbances would not exceed levels normally expected in healthy forests and woodlands. Relict stands would be maintained for biological and genetic diversity. Forests and woodlands would be managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield without permanent impairment of the productivity of the land and the quality of the environment; use of forest, woodland, and certain vegetation products in areas specified for this use, and other areas would be allowed to meet RMP goals. The National Healthy Forest Initiative would be implemented. The National Fire Plan would be implemented by conducting treatments to reduce fuel loadings, fire severity, and restoring historical disturbance regimes. Materials from such treatments, including those from hazard fuel reduction projects and wildland urban interface projects would be utilized.	Public utilization of forest and woodland species before and after vegetative treatments would be allowed to achieve desired future conditions. The utilization of forest and woodland species as a tool for vegetative treatments would be allowed. Public harvesting of forest and woodland species would be allowed to achieve the greatest output of forest and woodland products. This would be achieved by harvesting stands that have reached culmination of mean annual increment (growth begins to decrease). Stands would thereafter be grown and thinned to approximately 80-90% of "normal (maximum) basal area" until the culmination of mean annual increment, at which time the stand(s) would be cut again.	Public utilization of forest and woodland species would be allowed as one tool for vegetative treatments to achieve desired future conditions. Forests and woodlands would be managed to maintain and restore ecosystems to a condition in which biodiversity is preserved and occurrences of fire, insects, disease and other disturbances do not exceed levels normally expected in healthy forests and woodlands. Relict stands would be maintained for biological and genetic diversity. Forests and woodlands would be managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield without permanent impairment of the productivity of the land and the quality of the environment; use of forest, woodland and certain vegetation products in areas specified for this use, and other areas to meet RMP goals would be allowed. The Presidents healthy forests initiative would be implemented. The National Fire Plan would be implemented by conducting treatments to reduce fuel loadings, fire severity, and restoring historical disturbance regimes.	Unspecified.
A proactive program of woodland management would be initiated for the salvage of forest and woodland products that are dead and/or dying due to fire, disease, insect-kill, or other disturbance with the management intent of promoting healthy forest and woodlands.	Same as Alternative A.	The salvage of forest and woodland species would be allowed only when a threat to forest and woodlands or other resources within proposed ACECs (242,760 acres) exists. Salvage of forest and woodland for other resources on up to 343,110 acres outside of proposed ACECs would be allowed.	Unspecified.
Up to 552,663 acres of forest and woodland would have treatments or be harvested. Approximately 13,606 acres	Up to 554,108 acres of forest and woodland would have treatments or be harvested. Approximately 13,606 acres	Same as Alternative A.	Up to 88,200 acres of forest and 200,100 acres of woodlands would have treatments or be harvested.

TABLE 2.3 ALTERNATIVES			
Alternative A	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**	**Alternative D Current Management (no action)**
within WSAs would not have vegetation removal.	within WSAs would not have vegetation removal.		Approximately 13,606 acres within WSAs would not have vegetation removal.

Chapter Two—Table of Contents
(Section 2.2)

Error! No table of contents entries found.

Chapter Two—List of Tables
(Section 2.2)

Chapter Two—List of Figures
(Section 2.2)

Error! No table of figures entries found.

Chapter Two—Index
(Section 2.2)